

September 11, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

-1-8531

Admiral Moorer has authorized me to say to this Committee that he fully and strongly supports the need for the additional funds for antisubmarine warfare research which I am requesting in my amendment, the justification for which was fully testified to before the House Committee on Armed Services by Assistant Navy Secretary Robert Frosch and Vice Adm. Turner Caldwell, on June 19 of this year.

Admiral Moorer fully supports my contention here today that this research effort is most urgently needed from a military point of view, to enable us to develop the improved defenses vitally needed to counteract what has been a dramatically increased Soviet threat in the field of submarine warfare.

So I do hope that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and that this Committee of the Whole House, on the State of the Union will support my amendment when it is offered tomorrow.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat frustrating to undertake once again the arguments on the deployment of the Sentinel ABM which were advanced in the consideration of the military construction bill, but this will be my intention. At the appropriate time I will offer amendments en bloc to delete \$387 million, which would defer the deployment of the antiballistic missile system.

Now, it is with great care that I have come to this conclusion. It is upon a re-examination of the facts. Even though I argued this same question just a month ago in respect to the military construction bill, the Soviet's invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia has caused me to review my thinking. But after all this serious review I come before you today making precisely the same argument simply because the issue remains the same. The events of the last month in Czechoslovakia have not altered the reality that the Sentinel is an unnecessary expenditure of billions of dollars.

The argument which we advanced when we were discussing the military construction bill continues to be valid in respect to the anti-ballistic-missile system. The Sentinel ABM will do nothing to add to our defense. As I say, at the appropriate time we will ask that it be limited.

I am going to take the time I have available to me as a member of the committee to review some of the arguments. I will submit information for the RECORD.

I regret that many of us do not have the time to get into this subject in great detail. I do not want to sound pompous or qualified as a super-expert, but I will remind my distinguished colleagues that I have been living with this problem for a long time, formerly as a member of the Armed Services Committee and now as a member of the Appropriation Committee. I have been studying it in connection with arms control and disarmament matters for many years now, so I am not a stranger to the subject matter.

I am quite aware that the authorities are divided, but the opinions are honestly and very deeply held on both sides of the question.

In the first place, the conclusions that I have come to with many of our colleagues in this body and many of our distinguished colleagues in the other body are based on five very important facts.

A limited ABM deployment will probably not save American lives in the case of a Soviet attack.

An ABM deployment this year is not necessary to our security against China.

An ABM deployment threatens to escalate the arms race.

An ABM deployment is enormously costly, especially at this time.

Furthermore, it may be obsolete or ineffective even before it is operational.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are striking facts, but they are all ones which we believe can be supported by expert testimony. In the additional views filed by my colleagues, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRAMM] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], members of the committee, at the time of the argument on the military construction bill, we advanced these views. On July 25, 1968, in an effort to try to provide back-up arguments in support of our position to delete the ABM deployment moneys—as opposed to research and development moneys—we not only submitted for the record copies of our own views, but we put in the famous San Francisco speech of the distinguished Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, in which he discussed the ABM system in great detail.

I add to that material now by calling attention to the fact that in November of last year the Department of Defense put out a news release on the question of the ABM system. At the appropriate time I will put this in the RECORD. This release notes that this is a Chinese-oriented ABM system. It goes on to say further that the cost involved will be in the neighborhood of \$5 billion for the production and deployment of missiles. And this does not include operating costs, which will be about \$500 million each year.

Now, the fact of the matter is in earlier arguments we have made on this floor we pointed out very clearly—and it has been admitted by proponents of the system—that ultimately this system will cost something in excess of \$40 billion assuming that they were to carry the system out to its logical conclusion. This is an enormous sum, and a truly extravagant expense when it is considered that it buys us no more safety.

At the time when we presented materials for the record we produced what we hoped would be read very carefully—the Adelphi papers, "The Case Against Missile Defenses," by the distinguished scholar, Jeremy J. Stone, materials from the Foreign Affairs magazine on "The ABM Proliferation and International Stability," by Robert L. Rothstein, and other similar articles presenting very powerful arguments against the deployment of the ABM system. I again commend these materials to the attention of my colleagues.

In the time that I have available to me today, however, I would like to review what was essentially my summary at the time when we were arguing the military construction bill.

In responding to any threat I think it must be clear to us in the strategic planning involved that the Soviets will have to plan for the worst plausible case. They will therefore respond to our ABM by building more offsetting offensive capability than they need. In the event of a nuclear exchange more damage will be caused to the United States than if we never had deployed an ABM missile. It simply means that limited ABM deployment could actually cost more American lives rather than save them.

The simple fact is that the Soviet Union cannot allow us, as Secretary of Defense McNamara has repeatedly pointed out, to take away their assured destruction capability. They have the resources and capability to respond to new weapons deployed by the United States, as everyone in this Chamber would agree. And it is my opinion that our Sentinel will encourage them to build weapons to offset it. So we and they are faced with the prospect of multibillion dollar expenditures which will not add to the safety of either nation.

It seems to me this was the basis of the recent willingness of the Soviets to conduct talks and discussions on arms limitation. This logic still holds, even after Czechoslovakia.

In addition, our experts have told us that our response to the Soviet ABM deployment should be to expand our offensive capability, and this we have done. The Soviets will then be interested in the ABM for no other reason than to preclude further increases in our offensive weapons. This logic, too, still holds.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the strength of our bargaining position with the Soviets lies in our determination to maintain our assured destruction capability through increased offensive forces—not only at our present level but to improve upon that capability to the extent that we maintain our present relative posture.

Mr. Chairman, one thing which we discussed in the earlier debate was the fact that the Chinese would conduct long-range missile tests by the end of 1967. Those tests have still not been conducted. But this seems to matter little, for the Sentinel being aimed at the Soviets.

However, one must recall that former Secretary of Defense McNamara made it very clear when he stated that the Sentinel was not to be an anti-Soviet system. Sentinel will not work against the Soviets, and it probably will not work against the Chinese, because it is no defense against multiple warheads, orbiting bombs, sea-launched or low-trajectory missiles, or missiles carrying advanced radar-interference devices.

The Sentinel is not necessary against the Chinese and will not work against the Soviets; therefore why should we spend \$5 billion for it?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I had promised to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWD]. It develops, however, that I have only 2 minutes left.

MOR/CDF

H 32

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 11, 1968

Therefore, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] if he would join with me in allocating this time to the gentleman from New York by yielding 3 minutes to him so the gentleman would have the benefit of the full 5 minutes which I had promised to yield to him.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I shall be most pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

Mr. MAHON. I am also pleased to yield the remaining time on our side of the aisle to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank both the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California for accommodating me with these extra minutes.

Mr. Chairman, implicit in the total expense figure contained in today's Defense appropriation bill are the costs of the conflict in Vietnam. The Defense Department estimates that the Vietnam costs are \$25,784 million in fiscal 1969. This is 34 percent of the \$72,240 million total of the bill. Some of us will offer an amendment to reduce the total of the bill, not by 34 percent, but only a small fraction of that. We do not want to be extreme. We want to make the point that the only direction which American policy can properly follow is one of reducing the level of the Vietnam hostilities. An 8½-percent reduction of the total Defense budget would accord with widely accepted estimates by the Congressional Quarterly issue of June 28, 1968, that essentially this amount could be cut from the Defense budget without affecting any vital part of the program.

A good many of our leaders have been charmed of late by the incantation that Vietnam must not be debated while the talks are continuing in Paris. Well, I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, that not all of our leaders have succumbed. If ever our Nation needed debate on an issue, it is now. We only have the chance for great debate once in 4 years. The democratic process will fail us if the debate on Vietnam is not held in this presidential year.

For those of us who have from the beginning opposed the American involvement in Vietnam, the chance to express our view is only meaningful on the few occasions when these appropriation bills come before this body. The parliamentary situation here has never been such that we could have a full-scale debate on Vietnam. Special orders are a pretty feeble forum for the purpose. It is only here when we can offer an amendment that there is a chance for a fraction of the debate that ought to be taking place.

The prime quality of statesmanship is the ability to weigh the imponderables in a national or international situation. Statesmen are placed on the pedestal and crowned with laurel not because they can prove by numbers, or logic, or measurement, or mechanics, or by words, the answer to a problem in statecraft. Lesser men can find the answers to the demon-

strable problems. But the responsibility of statesmanship is to weigh the unmeasurable, to compare the incomparable, to value the dimensions and qualities of matters intangible and beyond the span of any calipers which men have yet devised.

Vietnam is a compound of such elusive problems. Here diverse matters are found that are remote from American experience, to say nothing of geography, economic factors, military considerations, psychological influences, monetary considerations, and military strategy. Only statesmanship of a supreme sort, able to make the value judgments about all of these complex factors in relation to one another, can resolve the problem for us.

On the other hand, our tragic involvement in Vietnam and the loss of thousands of our best young men can be laid to viewpoints that enlarge trivial and minor factors, while overlooking the enormous ones overriding in the situation.

Just for example, the U.S. Government has for years laid great stress on "aggression from the north" as a matter of monstrous concern and a justification for all the vast outpouring of our resources. Yet, it is doubtful whether the infiltration of men from North Vietnam into South Vietnam at the outset of the hostilities was aggression in the frame of the definition appearing in article 51 of the United Nations Charter; namely, "armed attack." It is doubtful that the aggression was even apparent to normal viewers. It was necessary that a book be written by our State Department so as to highlight the infiltration as "aggression."

At the very time that infiltration from North Vietnam was occurring in the early 1960's, the United States was sending its soldiers into South Vietnam, in numbers far exceeding the limitation of 685 stipulated for us in the Geneva Convention. Moreover, the State Department book indicates that at least half of the infiltrators were born in South Vietnam. What a curious rationalization it is that our men could come 10,000 miles to Vietnam, charging aggression against men who were born there.

I cite all this, Mr. Chairman, not so much to debate the issue, as to indicate the distortion of our value judgments about a secondary matter that we dredged up to justify the enormous infiltration of war and destruction upon a little people far away. These are a people who have been struggling for years to free themselves from foreign domination. Millions of them have been driven into refugee camps, their villages have been destroyed by American artillery and warplanes in the free fire zones. Their little children, and I have seen them, have been torn and burned by our bombardments. All of this is transpiring, Mr. Chairman, in an age when the nations neighboring to Vietnam, did succeed in securing their freedom from Western domination. For that is true of India, of Pakistan, of Malaysia, of Indonesia, of the Philippines, and I expect there are others.

Only Vietnam has been subjected to the steel and the flame because our statesmen have failed to judge properly, to weigh properly, to relate properly, such facts as the alleged "aggression

from the North" and the level of response it should entail.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, the annual occasion recurs when we call for a halt to this mistake by an amendment to the defense bill aimed at eliminating some portion of the \$25.7 billion that is being squandered annually in Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely—

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18707) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the Department of Defense appropriation bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the body of the Record, and include pertinent additional material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Czech RUSSIAN INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA UNDERSCORES NEED FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the few national organizations that predicted the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia is the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C. Over WFAN-TV last June, on the Georgetown University TV-Radio Forum in July during Captive Nations Week, and over both WINZ and WKAT-CBS in Miami at the beginning of August, its national chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, firmly maintained that colonialist Moscow could never afford the democratization of Czechoslovakia because it would be the beginning of the end of its own substrate empire in the U.S.S.R. The spillover into captive Ukraine would be disastrous. The National Captive Nations Committee has consistently held

September 11, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

that the real enemy of all the captive nations and that of the free world is Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. As in Hungary and other cases before, Moscow's action in Czechoslovakia fully confirms the position and shows up the falsity of contrary positions.

NCNC has also been the chief advocate of a necessary Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The Czechoslovak episode in Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism clearly underscores the need for such a committee. In the next Congress, I shall see that this will become one of the first orders of business. We have wasted more than enough time by not establishing this committee to concentrate on such developments as have enveloped in Czechoslovakia.

In the light of the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia, the events of the 10th observance of captive nations this past July have assumed even greater significance. Exemplary results of this observance continue to flow in, as the following interesting examples show: First, a proclamation by Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles and its board of supervisors, along with a declaration of the American Committee of California for Freedom Enslaved Nations; second, a program of the week in St. Louis, Mo., and a release by the Free Friends of the Captive Nations; third, three penetrating articles dealing with the week by Father Cletus Healy, Robert Morris, and Dr. Jose Ma. Hernandez; fourth, the program, resolutions, and an address at the Philadelphia Captive Nations Week observance on Independence Mall; and fifth, a news release by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America based on a letter from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky to Secretary of State Dean Rusk condemning the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the continued enslavement of a large part of the world's population by Russia affronts the Free World concept of individual liberty and human dignity; and

Whereas, the annual observance of Captive Nations Week calls attention to the plight of millions of unwilling captives of Communism in Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, as members of the Free World we deplore the conditions of tyranny and injustice existing behind the Iron Curtain and cherish the hope that all peoples the world over may one day live in peace and freedom;

Now, therefore, I, Sam Yorty, Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 14, 1968, through July 21, 1968, as "Captive Nations Week" in Los Angeles and urge all citizens to join in its observance and to support the efforts to bring the light of liberty shining through the darkness of the totalitarian enslaved nations of Eastern Europe:

SAM YORTY,
Mayor.

On motion of Supervisor Debs and Supervisor Debs for Supervisor Bonelli, unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles hereby proclaims the period of July 14 to 21, 1968 as "Captive Nations Week" in the County of Los Angeles and hereby urges all citizens to keep alive in their hearts freedom for all mankind in this troubled world.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles, ss:

I, James S. Mize, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, and ex officio clerk of the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing dis-

tricts for which said Board so acts, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the Original Minutes of Board Order No. 128 adopted on July 9, 1968 by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts for which said Board so acts.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the County of Los Angeles this 10th day of July 1968.

JAMES S. MIZE,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the
County of Los Angeles.

DECLARATION

The United States of America, the mightiest world power in the Twentieth Century, was built by the collective effort of pioneers and immigrants representing multi-varied cultural and historical heritages. From the earliest days, Americans of European ancestry have contributed substantially to the growth of the imposing edifice of American civilization. We would like to see their contribution more fully recognized. Today many millions of Americans adhering to traditions of Western Civilization consider it their patriotic duty to fully participate, with Americans of other ethnic backgrounds, in furthering the development of our common American heritage at all levels of federal, state and local government.

The Committee of Americans from Captive Nations has been formed to represent here over 25 million emigrants and descendants of emigrants from East European nations now in the United States of America and more than 120 million of their brethren residing in these countries.

We feel that the political and cultural aspirations of these nations are in close agreement with the vital interests of American Democracy, as attested to by the many contributions to the growth of American civilization made by the emigrants of these nations and their descendants.

It is for these reasons that we earnestly desire that our position be considered in formulating the guidelines of the United States foreign policy concerning these Captive Nations. The main issues are as follows:

1. There shall be self-determination through free elections by all subjugated nations and territories.

2. The Captive nations at present cannot be liberated either by war or a national uprising; therefore, we call upon all representatives to more effectively pursue the peaceful liberation from Communist domination.

3. It is requested that the United States encourage and aid these subject nations in the realization of their goal of self-determination since they are our greatest potential allies.

4. As American voters, our support of any party platform or candidate will be affected by their position on these issues.

WOLODYMYR SIYUK,
President.

COMMEMORATIVE WORSHIP SERVICE OF THE
FREE FRIENDS OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS, ST.
LOUIS-BASILICA, JULY 15, 1968

More than a billion human beings—one-third of the world's population—are enslaved by the tyranny of Communism. This fact represents a potent force who can become the free world's most reliable allies. And these allies, it should be noted, are not dependent upon foreign aid or any give-away programs. It is also important to note that the stronger the hope and urge of the captives for their freedom and independence, the weaker the threatening position of the Soviets and consequently the more secure is the status of the free world.

Any effort by the free world to help nations seeking to regain or preserve their inalienable right of self-determination is instantly met by shrill denunciations and charges of "interference" by the Communist camp.

Recognizing the need of reminding the population that there are many nations throughout the world which have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet Communism, the Congress of the United States in a joint resolution approved, authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time when freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations."—said then President Eisenhower.

Today's crucial issues, from Viet Nam to Hong Kong and the Mid-East situation adds an important dimension to the observance of this year's Captive Nations Week.

SEQUENCE OF THE PROCESSION

1. Police Escort.
2. American Flag, leading eight massed Free Friends of the Captive Nations flags, two abreast.
3. American Legion Color Guard.
4. Banner: "Captive Nations Week—etc."
5. Two Drummers.
6. Wreath with one or two costumed carriers.
7. Coffin carried by six men, followed by alternates and flanked by signs; "Victims—etc."
8. Individual Captive Nations flags followed by exiles from Communism, four abreast with lighted candles.
9. Banner: "We Are the Free Friends of the Captive Nations—etc."
10. Individual, native-born Americans and groups with identifying signs, four abreast with lighted candles.
11. Banner: "Remember the Peoples—etc."
12. Autos, single file, light on.
13. Sign: "End of the—etc."

A STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE FREE FRIENDS OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The armed takeover of Czechoslovakia is another tragic example of the complete control that international Communism, headquartered in Moscow, exerts over the captive countries. Even the slightest deviation from the strict communist discipline cannot be tolerated; the communists gain power by infiltration and subversion, and maintain power through brute force.

We invite all who are concerned to join with us in a dawn to dusk fast and a day of prayer on Sunday, September 1st. We will pray for the enslaved people of Czechoslovakia, who will surely be subjected to further murders and imprisonment, and we will pray for all of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe, Asia, and Cuba who are forced to live under the terror and tyranny of atheistic Communism.

We will also pray that our leaders will be enlightened as the true nature of Communism, and that they will re-evaluate our policy of "building bridges" to the communist governments—bridges that have been used exclusively as a conduit for subjugation of the people, including the use of armed might when necessary to stifle the yearning for freedom.

SOME THOUGHTS ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
(By Cletus Healy, S.J.)

Once again the third week in July, July 14 to 21, has been designated Captive Nations Week. To Americans who want to atone for the post-war forfeiture of Eastern Europe and China to the Communists it represents an opportunity.

This year, above all, America needs to be reminded of the moral basis of her greatness.

H 8534

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 11, 1968

We need the inspiration and the encouragement that comes from a rededication of ourselves to those Christian principles that made our nation revered as the defender of liberty and of the noble cause of freedom.

The only sufficient justification for America's involvement in two world wars is the fact that she was morally obliged to come to the defense of the threatened and the oppressed. With the advent of the 20th century, the world reached that stage of social, economic, and political maturity that any nation capable of doing so incurred the responsibility of resisting large-scale international injustice.

Among the national "goods" warranting vigorous defense, Pope Pius XII singled out especially the right of a nation to govern itself. That is why we were right in forcibly resisting Hitler when he took over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Hungary. And that is why we were wrong when we allowed Stalin to take over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Hungary—after we fought to take them away from Hitler. That is why we are right 25 years later in resisting slightly camouflaged aggression in South Vietnam today. That is why other nations are pseudo-Christian when they fail to mount a vigorous offensive against such mammoth international injustice themselves.

All crave peace, but not all are willing to pay the high price of peace. Peace is the work of justice. It is the prize of those who are willing to work for it, not of the craven pacifist. Forcible resistance to injustice saved the world from Hitler, but supine tolerance and rampant self-deception later surrendered one-third of the world to totalitarian Communism.

Surrender to Communism in neither intelligent politics nor is it Christian morality. In his 1948 Christmas address, Pope Pius XII pointed out the principles that should guide us:

"No nation should tolerate mammoth injustices if it would think and act as a Christian nation. All the more does the solidarity of peoples forbid others to act as mere spectators in an attitude of apathetic neutrality."

These are the principles that should dominate our thinking. The best way to atone to the people we have surrendered to Communism is to resist their oppressors where resistance is most urgently called for. That means we must do all we can to prevent the surrender of another nation to their oppressive yoke.

For this, politics is important; but politics is not our most important weapon. We need to spice the sacrifices of politics with the power of prayer. Prayer for the abandoned captive peoples is the major preoccupation of the League of Prayer for the Captive Peoples. Membership in the League requires merely that you offer one Mass and Communion a month for the captive people—a people who must hang on their Cross of oppression without the opportunity of participating in the Holy Sacrifice of the Cross, and who must climb the high mountain of sanctity without the nourishment that comes from the Bread of Angels.

For more information on the League, write to its Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Flynn, North 90, West 15992 Roosevelt Drive, Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Robert Morris)

For many years now the third week of July has been designated "Captive Nations Week." This institution was initiated by an act of Congress and it is implemented, annually, by a Presidential proclamation.

Of late, the implementation has been increasingly diluted until now it is virtually nonexistent. It is a sickening reflection of the decline of the interest of American lead-

ers for the plight of their brethren who are in Communist bondage around the world.

The plight of the captive peoples, from China to Stettin, is a strident moral issue. Our churches, above all, should be in the forefront of this very relevant concern.

Today we hear much of one civil right—the right to be free from discrimination because of race. It is good and necessary that we should be concerned with this basic right. For it is abhorrent that a child of God should be slighted or impugned because of the accidental color of his skin.

But the people in mainland China, in Latvia, in the Ukraine, in the Kuriles, haven't been denied one civil right. They have been denied their rights in their entirety!

The right to vote, to select their leaders, to freedom of speech, to freedom of press, to privilege against self-incrimination, to a right to a trial by a jury of one's peers, to peaceable assembly, to bear arms—these have been suppressed totally. Moreover, there is hard and fast discrimination in the Soviet orbit. It is severe in the Communist training schools, it is rampant in the U.S.S.R. Yet this is never mentioned by our leaders. While Soviet agents sack the United States as a well of racism—which it is not.

No one speaks out on this dreadful anomaly. It is obvious that those who should be asserting moral leadership are abdication their responsibility. Instead of speaking out for the immutable truths of God, of the rights and wrongs of today's society and of truth and justice, they are compromising in order to get along with the forces of mammon.

Churchmen should be moral leaders, not conformists with an amorphous consensus that is being eroded from within by enemies who are dedicated to our destruction.

The situation is even worse than that, as we pointed out in our recent column on the resolutions of the World Council of Churches at Uppsala, Sweden, wherein churchmen actually took their stand on the side of the Chinese Communist infidels.

As I write I, even if I am alone, am mindful that I am Captive Nations Week and I shall try to do something to perpetuate this high purpose. After all, we are dealing with one billion of our brothers in the fraternity of man. This is a burning issue.

[From the WACL Bulletin, June 1968]

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Men of today, and even the most reputedly intellectual of them, have taken it for granted that the Soviet Union is a monolithic empire and that it is as impregnable as a hermetically sealed bastion.

With a few bold and sharp blows Dr. Dobriansky smashes this myth of Russian monolithic inviolability. He presents facts and figures, against which no argument to the contrary is possible, that the Russians, after all, are not invulnerable and that, in the first place there is no such thing as a Soviet Union. It is a vast charnel house where 112 million Russians hold in the hollow of one hand the fate of 122 million Non-Russian whites the "Captive Nations" groaning beneath the heel of the Soviet Communist Party.

These hapless, helpless, but not hopeless hostages to fortune are being denied the basic and irreducible rights of free men by the heartless and inhuman masters of lies, deceit, intimidation, propaganda, and the *fata morgana* peaceful co-existence.

The Free World, and notably the United States of America, are now in a state of mesmeristic stupor by the Communist experts of Soviet cold war strategy and tactics, in order to drown the righteous cries and protests of the captive nations. This explains why the Captive Nations Week Resolution passed by the United States Congress in 1959

rocked the Soviet Empire to its foundations and the tremors are still being felt up to this hour. This Resolution was of such transcendental importance not only to the captive peoples under the yoke of Russian imperialism but also to the whole human race which must find in this great document the very essence of freedom without which there can be no peace on earth.

For instance, one of the most important parts of the Resolution reads: that "the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cosackie, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others . . ." It is quite clear that the Resolution is of tremendous significance in the history of man's struggle to be free from all sorts of bondage.

Needless to say the Resolution and the Proclamation that followed it immediately triggered a violent reaction in Communist Russia. Khrushchev went so far as to say, "The only enslaved peoples are in the capitalistic countries."

Dr. Dobriansky deplors the fact that in the United States there is a great deal of misunderstanding born of naivete or rank ignorance of the real nature of the Russian Empire. This ignorance has led many Americans into a maze of tragic contradictions.

The call for peaceful co-existence by the Russian Imperialists for example, has been taken at its face value without realizing that in Communist semantics an innocent-looking flower really hides a serpent beneath it. Many persons in the free world have jumped, as a consequence, to the conclusion that Soviet Russia means peace, that Soviet Russia's magnificent obsession is to establish peace all over the world.

Some influential Americans and well-meaning Europeans have even gone to the extent of believing that Russian communism will eventually evolve into a capitalistic democracy because of its apparent adoption of some of the free world's democratic economic and social measures. They point out that "the Russian doubling of the house-building rate, added investments in food production, the reduction of hours of labor, greater job mobility, the institution of installment credit, some market determination of production, the profit motive, and increases in pensions and peasant incomes" are sure indications of the Soviet Communists true spirit of reconciliation with the democracies and the principle of free enterprise.

The author says with regard to this: "The bounds of human illusion are sometimes indefinable." The motivation behind all these seemingly progressive and evolutionary economic changes is still the acquisition of more funds and resources to pursue Moscow's world-wide cold war operations.

The thesis of the whole book is quite clear. The free world and specially the United States of America must see through the make-believe front of Soviet Russia, must get deeply involved in the cold war, and beat Soviet Russia in her own game. The "ersatz Russian image must be destroyed." We must unmask the Russian bear and show him in his true colors. We must match his propaganda with more effective weapons of mass communication.

Dobriansky says, "On the information and propaganda front, our policy should concentrate on the captive nations, specially those in the USSR, the chief source of the world's problem on peace or war."

After building up on his thesis that Soviet Russia can be beaten at her own game, Dobriansky who is the Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, outlines

September 11, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

for America and the Free World what can be done in this respect. He concludes:

"Subject to conditions, climate, and circumstances, these devices and their uses include the Kerstern, freedom corps idea, a Freedom Commission and Academy, a Special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations, a revitalized Voice of America and a Radio Liberation as propaganda media, aid to underground resistance groups, a communications network ranging from secret printing to space satellites, economic warfare, diplomatic manipulations, the U.N. forum, facilities of friendly and like-minded countries, subversion of Red control centers, utilization of labor unions, churches, veteran groups and other private channels, money counterfeiting, bribery programs and so forth. The devices are endless, and the enormous difference between our use of them and the enemy's use of some of them is that we could enlist vastly more among the captives to participate than he can among free men. Of incalculable advantage to us is the other important dimension of the Cold War, namely between the captive nations and the Red-controlled state. Building the Johnsonian bridges of understanding helps the state, not the people or nation."

This monumental, well-documented book will certainly make few eyebrows rise—that is, if they have not been completely browbeaten by the Russian Communists.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE 10TH ANNIVERSARY HELD BY PHILADELPHIA CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE, SUNDAY, JULY 21, 1968, INDEPENDENCE MALL

PROGRAM

1. National Anthem.
 2. Invocation: Very Rev. John J. Falatek, representing His Eminence John Cardinal Krol.
 3. Opening Remarks: Austin J. App, Ph.D., Chairman, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.
 4. Reading of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Proclamation: Eulique V. Menocal, Ph.D.
 5. Reading of Governor Raymond P. Shafer's Proclamation and Greetings: Hon. Terim C. Hamilton, Member of the Cabinet.
 6. Proclamation and Greetings: Hon. James H. J. Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia.
 7. Address: Hon. Richard S. Schweiker, Member of the U.S. Congress.
 8. Introduction of Guests of Honor and Representatives of Nationalities: Mrs. Margit Rohltla, Secretary, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.
 9. Introduction of Girls in national costumes, representing various captive nations: Mrs. Ausra Zerr.
 10. Statement of the United Organizations of Women From Central and Eastern Europe: Mrs. Stephanie Wochok.
 11. Reading of Resolutions: Mr. Albert Baglan, Treasurer, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.
 12. Benediction: Rev. Stacey D. Myers, Jr., representing Bishop Fred P. Corson of the Philadelphia Methodist Churches.
- Master of Ceremonies: Mr. Ignatius M. Billinsky, Executive Vice Chairman, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.

GREATER PHILADELPHIA CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTIONS

(Approved by acclamation at the mass rally on Independence Mall, July 21, 1968)

Whereas, This is the tenth anniversary since Congress on July 17, 1959, requested the President annually to proclaim the third week of July Captive Nations Week "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world"; and

Whereas, President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 10 proclaimed July 21-27 Captive Nations Week for 1968, and Governor Raymond P. Shafer on July 11 for Pennsylvania, and

Mayor James H. J. Tate on July 12 for Philadelphia; and

Whereas, the U.S. is fighting a costly war to prevent South Vietnam from becoming a captive nation like the twenty-two enumerated by Congress in 1959; and

Whereas, the U.S. intervened in both World Wars in order to promote self-determination and freedom; and

Whereas, this year marks the passage of 50 years since the conclusion of the First World War, as result of which many nations, such as: Armenia, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Turkestan, Ukraine and others—gained freedom and national independence, but subsequently became victims of Soviet-Russian imperio-colonialism, having been forcibly deprived of the exercise of their sovereignty and of basic political, religious, social, cultural and economic rights and liberties—and subjugated to continuous oppression and genocide; and

Whereas, these nations together with artificially formed communist East Germany, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Mainland China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba—became the terrain for the realization of the imperialistic plans of Moscow and Peking; and

Whereas, peoples of these captive nations, despite the terror forced upon them by the communist rulers, continually strive to free themselves from the yoke of Soviet-Russian colonialism and communist oppression;

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia and this assemblage gathered at historical Independence Mall this July 21, 1968,

That the U.S. similarly implement an unswerving policy of promoting the self-determination and independence of the captive nations forced under communistic Russian and Chinese colonialism since 1920, many of whom have long proven their capacity for self-government; and

That the U.S. regard with benevolence and judiciously support all honorable and realistic liberation movements, both within and without the Red bloc; and

That it replace the policy of coexistence and containment, which immorally consigns many nations to hopeless Soviet-Russian and communistic Chinese colonialism; by the moral policy of seeking actively to roll back the Iron-Bamboo-and-Sugar Curtains;

That it also recognize coexistence and containment as inexpedient and dangerous in that it leads to the continuous erosion of the Free World until the alternative may well be total surrender, or total war—at a moment when the Red bloc is strongest and the Free World weakest; and

That, to prevent this erosion of the area of freedom, the U.S. should pursue a determined policy by all moral, diplomatic, and economic means to bring about the dissolution of Red colonialism, especially the Soviet-Russian empire; and

That it restrict any trade, aid, and exchanges with the Red bloc which help the puppet regimes more than the oppressed populations; and

That it entirely stop all shipments to the Red bloc of such raw materials and machinery which are known to be diverted to the support of the North Vietnamese aggression and endanger our armed forces; and

That, if the peace talks in Paris do not soon become constructive, the U.S. should give Hanoi the alternative of withdrawing from South Vietnam or suffer a liberating invasion calculated to free the North Vietnamese people and reunite all Vietnam on the basis of self-determination; and

That it will not let the peace talks in Paris become a shield for North Vietnamese build-up and increasing attacks and restrain us from effective counter-measures; and

That the governmental and popular wish for peace, almost at any price, must on no account seduce us into betraying the people

of South Vietnam or of West Berlin, or of any of our allies anywhere; and

That the U.S. should beware of special treaties with Soviet Russia, like the proposed nuclear non-proliferation treaty, which appear to make the U.S. a partner and supporter of the Soviet-Russian empire; and

That the United Nations put on the agenda of its General Assembly the problem of captive nations and investigate their plight under communist yoke; and

That, finally, to give more voice to the American commitment to the eventual independence of the captive nations the House of Representatives should establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations and initiate a Congressional review of U.S. policy towards the USSR; and

Be it further resolved that copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President, the Secretary of State, both Senators from Pennsylvania, and all Representatives of the Greater Philadelphia area—and to newspapers, radio and television stations of the area.

AUSTIN J. APP, Ph. D.,
Chairman.
IGNATIUS M. BILLINSKY,
Executive Vice Chairman.
MARGIT ROHTLA,
Executive Secretary.
ALBERT BAGLAN,
Treasurer.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) America,
July 25, 1968]

A FREE WORLD MUST FREE THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Austin J. App, Ph.D., chairman, Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia; Address given at the Captive Nations Week Observance, Independence Mall, Philadelphia, July 21, 1968)

As chairman of the Greater Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee I warmly welcome all of you to our tenth Captive Nations Observance since Congress first requested it on July 17, 1959. Our committee is happy to see so many of you, including so many officials of various ethnic societies, here today in Philadelphia's Independence Mall, where the captive colonies 192 years ago proclaimed their independence from the British empire.

We who want the captive nations similarly freed from the far more oppressive Soviet Russian colonialism are grateful to Congress for requesting this annual observance, to President Johnson for proclaiming this Captive Nations Week, and to Governor Shafer for issuing the Commonwealth proclamation and honoring us with his representatives, the Honorable Terin C. Hamilton, to read it. We are gratified that our own Mayor Tate of Philadelphia, as last year and the years before, issued a proclamation and is here to greet us.

The purpose of Captive Nations Week is to mobilize world opinion to demand freedom for both the satellite nations, like Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, and also for the non-Russia nations within the USSR, like Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Armenia, Cossackia, and others. Congress in 1959 listed twenty-two satellite and captive nations, including North Korea and North Vietnam, as enslaved by "Communist imperialism." Now also Cuba is one of them, and American boys are dying every day to keep South Vietnam free!

We and all Americans who observe Captive National Week, to quote former President Eisenhower in his first proclamation of 1959, want "freedom and independence . . . for all the captive nations of the world." But since 1918 and 1945, happily, Western colonialism has practically disappeared. Ireland and India, the Philippines and Morocco are free, Britain and France, Belgium and Holland have liberated their colonies. Aus-

tria in 1918 and Japan in 1945 were forced to free theirs.

The one empire that has not freed a single one of its enslaved peoples is Soviet Russia. On the contrary, it has extended its brutal colonialism and secured it with such barbarisms as the Berlin Wall, the Iron Curtain, and the tanks and machine guns that in 1953 murdered the freedom fighters of East Berlin and in 1956 those of Budapest. This very summer when enslaved Czechoslovakia started to loosen its chains, Soviet Russian tanks moved in for maneuvers—and are still there!

Yet America and the Free World have for decades patiently accepted Soviet Russia's attacks on real and imaginary Western colonialism. They have liberated, often prematurely, their African and Asian colonies. But they have not clearly and consistently demanded that Soviet Russia similarly give independence to its captive and satellite nations. We who observe Captive Nations Week urgently ask our fellow countrymen and the world to demand this independence for the captive nations under Communist domination.

Happily most Americans, including elected officials, give at least lip service to freedom for the satellite nations. These with 102 million people in 393,000 square miles were betrayed into Soviet tyranny at Yalta. Even Americans soft on Communism generally wish Moscow would free these victims of Roosevelt-Stalin peace dictating. But they do not demand it loudly and insistently, and they certainly don't demonstrate for this morally required liberation!

Unhappily, when it comes to the captive nations within the USSR, most liberals and many poorly informed other Americans do not even really want independence for them. They want to think that the Union of Soviet Republics is all Russian, ethnically and culturally, the way Californians and Pennsylvanians and Texans are American. They tend to feel that giving Ukraine and the Baltic nations back their independence would be dismembering Russia the way in 1945 the Morgenthauistic victors dismembered Germany. They do not want Russia dismembered vis-a-vis Germany. Shockingly, even elements in the government accept the Soviet Russian empire as a necessary "police system to keep law and order." In April, 1963, the U.S. Arms Control Agency instructed whom it concerned that "The break-up of the Russian Communist empire" would be "catastrophic for world order."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is this sort of shocking acceptance of the Red colonialism on the part of the Free World, this virtual and semiofficial approval of Soviet Russia, the most tyrannical colonialism in history, the only one that ever needed a wall and an Iron Curtain, not to keep enemies out, but its own people in, which gives the Red dictators their prestige and prevents world opinion and the oppressed peoples from rolling back and breaking up the Soviet Russian empire.

Morally oriented and freedom loving men and women must insist that this Red empire dissolve, the way every empire in history, even benevolent ones, had to end. Colonialism cannot be a way of life in a world that preaches human rights and democracy.

Dissolving the USSR does not mean dismembering Russia proper. We want a strong and healthy Russia, but a Russia of Russians, not one of a majority of enslaved foreign nationalities, a Russia brought down to its own size. The Soviet Russian empire now, the USSR, is an immense area of 8,647,172 square miles, more than the U.S. and Canada and Mexico together. It is almost three times the size of China, and of Australia, and six times the size of India.

It has a population of 235,000,000, but of these only 110 million are Russian, the other 125 million are Ukrainians, Balts, Belorussians and others. They speak their own languages and have their own culture. They

are no more Russian than the Poles are Russian, or the Arabs are Turks, or the Irish are Britons. This must be unequivocally recognized by Americans.

These captive peoples inhabit 2,053,781 square miles of land that has been theirs for centuries. But if they and their lands are given their rightful independence, Russia will still be three times their size with 6,593,391 square miles. This is twice the size of continental United States. It would have a population of 110,000,000 ethnic Russians. It would therefore still be by far the largest and the strongest nation in Europe, about as populous as Germany and France combined.

That is the rightful Russia which liberating the captive nations will establish. It will have nothing to fear from any country in Europe, but it will also no longer be a threat to Western Europe or to world peace. Russia, once its captive nations are liberated, will not be threatened by anyone and will have no cause to threaten anyone else. The only serious danger of a third world war, or of a nuclear war will have been removed.

And we believe this is the only way to remove the threat of a third world war. We believe if the policies recommended in the Resolutions we are submitting will be implemented resolutely, if the American people, and the American government resolutely throw all their moral, economic, and diplomatic support to the aspirations and efforts for freedom of the captive nations, these nations can without a world war be liberated. Not even totalitarian dictators can long defy righteous, concerted world opinion allied with the just aspirations of most of their people. This liberation we are morally bound to work for and to pray for—and God willing to achieve.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE RAPS RUSSIAN SEIZURE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA, DEMANDS BREAK IN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND U.S.S.R.

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA), speaking on behalf of some 2-million American citizens of Ukrainian descent, condemned the Soviet Russian seizure of Czechoslovakia and demanded the immediate suspension of diplomatic relations with the United States with the USSR and three other Communist states which took part in the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University professor and President of the UCCA, dispatched a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk urging strong and immediate action by the U.S. Government. In it the UCCA President called for "immediate suspension of diplomatic relations with the USSR," suspension of all trade and cultural exchange agreements, an action in the U.N. Security Council toward the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Czechoslovakia, the immediate convocation of the NATO allies for "redressing its military posture" and "immediate and unstinted support of the Captive Nations," who will prove "to be the surest and most dependable allies of the United States."

In conclusion, Dr. Dobriansky pointed out that our policy of not "inconveniencing the Russians" has encouraged the Kremlin militarists and totalitarians to bolder acts of aggression and provocation.

(Text of UCCA Letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk is attached.)

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,

New York, N.Y., August 28, 1968.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, representing over 2-million American citizens of Ukrainian ancestry, is deeply shocked and con-

cerned over the brutal aggression against an invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist satellites of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and East Germany.

This act of naked rape and violation of a sovereign state by the powerful militaristic Soviet Russian empire is one of the latest acts of aggression and violation of other nations' rights and sovereignties.

The underlying reason for this unprovoked invasion was the fear of the Kremlin leaders—not fear of the Czechoslovak army numbering some 175,000 men—but fear of the ideals of freedom, which threatened the shaky Russian Communist empire.

We are writing you, Mr. Secretary, to urge you to undertake necessary steps by the U.S. Government to place the Soviet government in its proper light in the eyes of the world, namely, to condemn the USSR as an unbridled aggressor and violator of the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia.

In protesting against the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and its allies, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is especially concerned with the effect the invasion may have on the 45-million Ukrainian nation which neighbors Czechoslovakia. As you undoubtedly know, the Soviet government has been ruthlessly persecuting Ukrainian intellectuals and youth for clamoring for more freedom and for the development of Ukrainian culture, literature and the Ukrainian language. According to latest reliable reports, the events in Czechoslovakia spurred Soviet Russian persecution of the Ukrainian people, especially persecution of the Ukrainian intellectual elite—writers, poets, literary critics, professors, scientists, and the like.

Furthermore, Mr. Secretary, the Russian Communist invasion of Czechoslovakia has placed the Ukrainian national minority in Eastern Slovakia at the mercy of Russian Communism. There are some 150,000 Ukrainians in Eastern Slovakia, who had been allowed by the Dubcek government the free development of their national culture and traditions, and above all, their religious life. The Ukrainian Rite Catholic Church was officially restored last May by the Prague government, and some 125,000 Ukrainian Rite Catholics were allowed to practice their own traditional religion in freedom under their spiritual leader, Bishop Vasyly Hopo, who spent 13 years in Communist jails under the Stalinist rule of Antonin Novotny. Now all these newly-gained freedoms of the Ukrainian minority in Czechoslovakia may be expected to be curtailed or totally eradicated by the Russian Communist totalitarians.

The shameless invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union demonstrates once again the undeniable truth that the Soviet Union is the continuation of the old Czarist empire, and that Communist ideology serves only as a cover for traditional Russian imperialism and colonialism. Moreover, the myth propagated by some in our government that "Russian Communism has mellowed" has become indefensible farce, in view of the aggressive designs of Communist Russia toward other Communist states, such as Rumania and Yugoslavia.

Therefore, on behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America we would like to suggest to you to take the following steps:

1. Immediate suspension of diplomatic relations with the USSR and its Communist puppet governments of Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria;

2. Immediate suspension of all trade agreements and cultural exchange pacts with the USSR and its three satellites which were guilty of contributing to the military aggression against Czechoslovakia;

3. Immediate action on the part of the U.S. Government in the U.N. Security Council for the purpose of vigorous and serious demands for the complete withdrawal of all foreign troops from Czechoslovakia;

September 11, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8537

4. Immediate convocation of the NATO Allies for the purpose of revising its obsolete policies and redressing its military posture to meet the new Russian threat to Western Europe;

5. Immediate and unstinted support of the Captive Nations, held in bondage by the Soviet Union, who will prove to be the surest and most dependable allies of the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Secretary, we wish to point out that our policy of caution and "bridge-building" has proven not only unrealistic and naive, but also very dangerous to our national security and to the safety of the free world. Our policy of not "inconveniencing the Russians," which was followed by the rest of the free world, has encouraged the Kremlin militarists and totalitarians to bolder acts of aggression and provocation.

We sincerely hope that the death of freedom in Czechoslovakia and the occupation of that country by Soviet and other Communist troops will serve as a severe lesson to all who thought that Communist Russia under the Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership is not an enemy of the civilized world.

We respectfully submit, Mr. Secretary, that the U.S. Government will lose prestige as a world power and champion of freedom if it permits the brutal Soviet Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia to go unchallenged.

Respectfully yours,
LEW E. DOBRIANSKY,
President.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the new coal mine health and safety legislation proposed by the administration is designed specifically to remedy a major weakness in our existing law. This deficiency is the lack of enforcement provisions that can effectively control hazards in the most dangerous part of any operating coal mine.

Right now our Federal mine inspectors are powerless to enforce essential safety standards at the very point of greatest danger underground—the working face of the mine. When an inspector, in the course of his duty, reaches the place where the coal is actually being extracted from the seam, he can point out hazardous conditions and recommend corrective measures. He can even plead for action; but beyond that he is powerless. He can only hope that no accident occurs.

The proposed Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1968 recognizes this shortcoming in the present law. This bill would, for the first time, extend Federal enforcement to the face of the mine. And it would back that enforcement with penalties strong enough to assure that hazardous conditions called to an operator's attention are promptly and adequately corrected.

Experience since the passage of the law that is now in force has shown clearly the inadequacies of that law. Knowing the deficiency, and having been presented with a remedy, we can no longer ignore our responsibilities. We must take action now.

HOOR OF MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 a.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what will be the business on tomorrow other than the Defense appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have the conference report on the redwoods bill. Then there is the further consideration of the appropriation bill and there is the national scenic rivers bill. With the disposal of those matters, we would then hope to go over until the following Monday.

Mr. GROSS. And any other business that was programmed for this week will not be called up this week; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, the gentleman has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, has it been decided exactly how the bills will come up? Will the Defense appropriation bill be on the calendar first on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would say, I think the Defense bill would be first. The chairman is anxious to dispose of this bill and certainly the leadership is anxious to dispose of the bill so I will make the statement that we will continue with the Defense Department appropriation bill. Then the redwoods conference report will be the next order of business, and following that the national scenic rivers bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is not planned then to bring up the foreign aid conference report?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; not this week.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE TRUCK BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I referred to the fact that the national press has overwhelmingly expressed its dissatisfaction with the truck bill before the House. Of the nearly 300 newspapers which have taken an editorial stand on this bill, I have found only one which has supported it. Today,

I am inserting in the Record editorials and columns from newspapers all over the country. I want the Members to look closely at them. They express the sentiment of the people of America and not just a small special-interest group. They are not concerned with increased profits or special advantage but with the well-being of our Nation's cities and towns. The editorials I am inserting are just a sampling of the feeling of our newspapers. I urge all to heed their dire warnings and to oppose this bill before the House. The editorials follow:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, July 14, 1968]

FREIGHT TRAINS—NO RAILS

If you drive a normal-sized vehicle on the public highways, prepare to be awed. If not scared.

Congress is in the process of legalizing highway freight trains.

According to the report of the House Public Works Committee, which has cleared a new truck-weight bill for House action, boxcars on tires up to 69 tons would be permitted on the Interstate highway system.

Four committee members who voted against the bill (already passed by the Senate) said they had some doubt whether even the 69-ton limit would be effective.

The bill not only raises the weight limits, but increases width limits and would permit triple-trailer trucks.

The Public Works Committee rationalizes this startling increase in roadway grants by claiming "beneficial effects on the economy" and vaguely suggesting that "savings" from the use of the huge trucks might be passed along to consumers and "work to the advantage of the public in general."

We are much more impressed by the minority report which points out that the bill carries no new taxes or charges for these behemoths of the beltway, although the Federal Budget Bureau said increased user charges were an "essential complement" to the higher weight limits.

The Budget Bureau said the bigger trucks would raise the costs and reduce the life of the highways. The Public Roads Bureau director said such trucks would "overstress" the bridges on the Interstate highway system by 32 to 36 per cent.

This legislation, the minority committeeman said, was opposed in testimony before the committee by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Automobile Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and by many state highway departments.

All this was ignored by the majority of the House Public Works Committee, just as it was ignored by the Senate.

So, if the House approves the bill, the taxpayers will be stuck again, highways will deteriorate faster than before and the motorist—well, if some of the monsters now on the roads make him nervous, wait until these new freight trains roar up behind him!

Talk of lesser juggernauts boiled up on Capitol Hill in Nashville last January when a 65-foot, not-over-73,000-pound twin-trailer rig was put on display by the Tennessee Motor Transport Association.

Fortunately the outcry over the proposed increase of 10 feet in length was such across the state that a bill to allow the twin-rigs was never introduced in the state Legislature.

But now we are faced with a greater menace. If you're concerned, let Reps. Duncan, Quillen, Brock, Evins and others hear from you. The time to blow your horn for safety is now.

H8538

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 17, 1968

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times,
July 26, 1968]

BACKFIRE ON TRUCK-TRAINS

One need not deny the usefulness to American society of the trucking industry to recognize that the industry's interest and the public interest are sometimes in conflict. This seems to be one of those times.

Despite disapproval of the chief federal highway engineer and many, perhaps all governors, Congress is looking with favor on legislation which could result in virtual truck-trains on Interstate highways and connecting roads. Expressing his opposition to the pending bill, Gov. Ellington—who is not much known, by the way, for bucking truckers—noted that the proposed additions to length, weight and width of cargo trucks would increase wear on the expensive Interstate system and result in higher maintenance costs to the states.

Reportedly, many influential and strategically placed representatives and senators have benefitted from trucking industry contributions to their campaigns. Such questionable lobbying can backfire, however, if the public is sufficiently aroused.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1968]
TRUCKERS BEARING GIFTS

Do you want longer, wider and heavier trucks on the highways?

It is doubtful if very many people outside the trucking industry would answer that question affirmatively. Yet the Senate last April without a record vote passed a bill which would permit trucks on the interstate highway system to be a foot wider and to increase their gross weight from the present limit of 73,000 pounds to as much as 138,000 pounds or more. The new limit is not easily defined because it is figured according to a formula based on a truck's wheelbase and number of axles. Since there is no limit on the length of truck-trailer combinations, trucks pulling two trailers would become common and those pulling three would be feasible.

The American Automobile Association has properly characterized these enormous truck-trailers as "rubber-tired freight trains on the nation's roads" and warned of the increased peril they would present for ordinary motorists. Moreover, incalculable sums running into the hundreds of millions of dollars will be needed to strengthen existing bridges to sustain such truckloads and to rebuild roads worn out prematurely. Yet the House Public Works Committee has cleared this bill for floor action.

So far this is a fairly familiar tale of an industry pushing a piece of special-interest legislation through Congress. But the story gained added significance when enterprising reporters of The Washington Daily News and The Des Moines Register analyzed the recent political campaign contributions of the truck operators' "nonpartisan committee." It turned out that fifteen members of the House Public Works Committee in both parties have received contributions ranging from \$500 to \$1,500 apiece. For Representative John Kluczynski, Democrat of Illinois, Chairman of the Public Roads Subcommittee and the man more responsible than anyone else for the execrable, lobbying-loving highway bill, the truckers recently bought \$2,000 worth of tickets.

A similar pattern of contributions exists for thirteen members of the House Interstate Commerce Committee which recently cleared another bill desired by the commercial truckers which would have the effect of cutting down on their competition from trucks owned by farm cooperatives.

Representative Fred Schwengel, Republican of Iowa, has courageously called attention of the House to these disclosures and written the House Ethics Committee urging an inquiry. For his efforts, we think Mr. Schwengel deserves a medal instead of the punch in the nose which one self-right-

eous member—Representative Dingell of Michigan—threatened to give him. A full investigation of the trucking industry's efforts to influence legislation is clearly necessary.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, July 18, 1968]
HIGHWAY MONSTERS

The trucking lobby is roaring along at high speed in its crusade for bigger trucks. A bill to increase the weight limits per axle and widths of trucks using the Federal Interstate Highway system has passed the Senate and has been approved by the House Public Works Committee. Now the House will decide on the measure, which opponents fear will mean trucks nine feet wide and weighing in excess of 138,000 pounds.

Of course, the proliferation of these monsters would spill over into congested cities. And the punishment inflicted on the nation's highways has been summarized by the American Association of State Highway Officials: a reduction in pavement life of 20 per cent and an increase of resurfacing costs of 30 per cent. The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads puts the monetary cost at \$1.8 billion.

In addition, Federal Highway Commissioner Lowell K. Bridwell has some grim figures on heavy commercial vehicles already plying the highways. Though such trucks constitute only 7 per cent of the nation's motor vehicles, they have been involved in 19 per cent of the highway fatalities. For every truck driver thus killed, 38 others have died, according to the U.S. Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety.

The haulers and their friends in Congress see bigger trucks as necessary to increase profits. What they would do to the rest of us is apparently none of the industry's concern.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1968]
CITY DECREES U.S. BILL TO RAISE TRUCK LOAD LIMITS

(By Seth S. King)

The city joined yesterday in the protests against Federal legislation that would allow wider, longer, and heavier trucks to operate on interstate roadways.

Commissioner of Highways Constantine Sidamon-Eristoff warned that this legislation, which would permit gross truck weights up to 138,000 pounds, could bring vehicles onto city streets that damage surfaces and break down utility systems underneath.

In a letter to Peter F. Tufo, the city's legislative representative in Washington, Mr. Sidamon-Eristoff said that most of the city's 6,000 miles of streets were designed for maximum loads of 72,000 pounds.

They are constructed under regulations established by the Board of Estimate in 1912 and only slightly amended in 1926, he said. "These regulations had as their purpose the development of a city concerned with living space and not super trucks," the commissioner said.

State laws governing truck size on state highways now limit gross weights to 71,000 pounds, less than the current Federal limit of 72,000. But these limits do not apply to New York City, Mr. Sidamon-Eristoff said.

He noted that legislation was now pending before the City Council to extend the state regulations to city streets.

The Commissioners of Highways and Traffic have the authority to require permits for certain types of oversized vehicles. But some streets within the city are governed by Federal regulations.

The city's streets cover large systems of water, sewer, gas, electricity, and telephone lines. They are not, Mr. Sidamon-Eristoff said, designed to carry the vehicular loads contemplated in the Federal legislation.

The Senate has passed the truck legislation. It has also been approved by the House Public Works Committee, but has not been voted on by the full House of Representatives.

In addition to the increase in allowable gross weights to 138,000 pounds, the Federal legislation would allow widths to be increased from eight to nine feet, including safety gear.

The American Automobile Association and the United States Conference of Mayors have already registered strenuous objections to the Federal bill.

[From the Durham, N.C. Herald,
Aug. 14, 1968]

TRUCK TRAINS COST AND HAZARD

It is gratifying to see a growing concern over and a rising opposition to passage of the bill to allow the use of triple-trailers on interstate highways (S-2658). This past Sunday, the Automobile Club of Virginia took a full-page advertisement in some of the papers of that state to point out the heavy cost, in traffic safety and in highway maintenance costs, enactment of this bill would put upon the people of the United States.

This bill has already passed the Senate and is expected to come to a vote in the House of Representatives when Congress reconvenes after the convention recess. There is still time for those concerned for highway safety to let their representatives in Congress know of their opposition to a bill which will permit truck trains of three trailers measuring over 100 feet in length to use the highways.

Recognizing that such truck trains must be loaded and unloaded off the interstate highways and must use other streets and roads to get to the highways, the United States Conference of Mayors recently adopted a resolution urging defeat of this bill because the increase in size and weight of trucks will "shorten the service life of existing highways facilities and multiply the financial burden of all street and road authorities for maintaining and replacing roads and streets prematurely damaged."

The Virginia advertisement quotes Douglas B. Fugate, commissioner of highways in that state, as saying that enactment of this bill would require to replace 1,430 of the 1,662 bridges on the primary highways there at a cost of \$151,000,000, would increase new pavement costs by over 15 per cent to carry the added weight, and would increase highway maintenance costs in that state over \$18,000,000 per year. Will the trucking industry pay these additional costs which would benefit only that industry? No, the individual taxpayers whom the truck trains will force off the highways will bear the greater part of the burden. It would be interesting to get from the North Carolina Highway Commission an estimate of the added costs S-2658 would put on this state, already hard-pressed to find the money to keep its highway system up-to-date.

Cost isn't all. Even more significant is the element of safety, in which human health and life are at stake. According to the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, almost half the accidents involving trucks and resulting in death or injuries are collisions with automobiles. In such accidents, 38 occupants of automobiles die to every truck driver. In this connection, it may be noted also that according to Lowell K. Bridwell, federal highway administrator, heavy trucks constitute only seven per cent of the registered motor vehicles in the United States, travel 11 per cent of the total mileage of motor vehicles in this country, but are involved in 19 per cent of highway fatalities. Is it any wonder that those concerned for highway safety are opposed to a bill which would markedly increase the size and weight of trucks using the highways?

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) News July 24, 1968]

TRIPLE-TRAILER TRUCKS

The domino theory may not make a great deal of sense in its Southeast Asian applica-